

## REMARKS

Regarding objection to the drawings, a new Figure 1 is enclosed herewith which is the only figure on that sheet.

Applicant has enclosed herewith an amended Abstract.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 2, under Section 112, has been satisfied with the replacement of the period on line 14 with a semicolon.

The rejection of Claim 3, under Section 103(a), as unpatentable over Van Vleet in view of Pool et al. is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 has been amended to more clearly define the novel relationship as the carrier frame is rotated out of its horizontal working position. The one castor wheel which maintains contact with the ground is rotated along with its supporting leg as the carrier frame is lifted so that the ground supporting wheel maintains a normal relationship with the ground through a parallelogram linkage connecting the supporting leg of the wheel with the tractor frame. This concept is not taught by either Van Vleet or Pool et al. Claim 3 has been amended so that the leg supporting one of the wheels is a "horizontal" leg which cannot be read on the vertical pivot pin supporting a castor wheel 44 of Van Vleet. While Van Vleet does teach a carrier frame supporting a cutting deck which rotate about a similar axis to that of applicants, there is no castor wheel which supports the lawn mower deck as does applicant's castor wheel 20 which is rotatably journaled in the carrier frame through a parallelogram linkage so that wheel 20 remains aligned normal to the ground even though the carrier frame and deck are in a vertical position as shown in Figure 6.

The Pool et al. reference certainly does teach a carrier frame and working deck which rotates about a similar longitudinal axis. However, the castor wheel 60 of Pool does not move in a parallelogram linkage as the carrier frame is elevated. Pool's support wheel 24 is not


mounted on the tilting carrier frame, and therefore, there is no need or reason for its supporting leg to rotate about a horizontal axis.

Claim 3 now appears to be in condition for allowance.

New added Claims 4, 5 and 6 are all dependent on independent Claim 3, and therefore, would also be allowable.

The application appears to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,




Edward L. Brown, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
125 N. Market, Suite 1100  
Wichita, KS 67202  
Phone: (316) 263-6400  
Fax: (316) 263-5491  
Email: elbrownjr@aol.com

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this Amendment, Abstract, and replacement Drawing are being deposited in the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage to the United States Patent and Trademark Office to the Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 24, 2004



(Michelle Green)